

J. W. FULBRIGHT, ARK., CHAIRMAN

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, R.I.  
JOHN SPARKMAN, ALA.  
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, MINN.  
MIKE MANSFIELD, MONT.  
WAYNE MORSE, OREG.  
RUSSELL B. LONG, LA.  
JOHN F. KENNEDY, MASS.  
ALBERT GORE, TENN.  
FRANK J. LAUSCHE, OHIO  
FRANK CHURCH, IDAHO

ALEXANDER WILEY, WIS.  
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, IOWA  
WILLIAM LANGER, N. DAK.  
GEORGE D. AIKEN, VT.  
HOMER E. CAPEHART, IND.  
FRANK CARLSON, KANS.

## United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

September 18, 1959

CARL MARCY, CHIEF OF STAFF  
DARRELL ST. CLAIRE, CLERK

11-7807  
*[Handwritten signature]*  
*[Handwritten initials]*

Honorable Allen Dulles  
Director  
Central Intelligence Agency  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Dulles:

Senator Fulbright asked me to send you the attached notes which were taken by a member of the staff during the informal meeting on Wednesday between members of the Senate and Chairman Khrushchev.

Although the notes do not show "quotes", in fact the notes are practically verbatim.

Sincerely yours,

*[Handwritten signature of Carl Marcy]*

Carl Marcy

Enclosure

Notes on Informal Meeting with Premier  
Khrushchev, at tea, 5:00 p.m., Room F-53,  
Capitol, on September 17, 1959

Senator Fulbright: Mr. Chairman and Genelemen: On behalf of the Members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and other Members of the Senate of the United States, I welcome you to this informal meeting in this historic Committee room.

Under our Constitutional system, the Committee on Foreign Relations has a particular responsibility regarding our relations with the Soviet Union and all other foreign countries.

I have long believed that meetings between people who have different views about important matters is an appropriate way to proceed. We are glad to have you here today, and I am glad you and our President are to have conversations about our relations.

Your country and our country are powerful communities with vast natural resources and with energetic and talented people. It would be difficult to put a limit upon what either of our countries individually can accomplish given the desire to do it.

By working together, the principal afflictions of the people of the whole world might well be eliminated.

Even competitive coexistence, with significant mutual reduction of armaments, will give the world an opportunity to make vast strides in raising the living standards of people everywhere.

A nuclear war between our countries can bring only universal devastation and abject misery to all mankind.

I believe you, Mr. Chairman, when you say you do not wish to settle our differences by nuclear warfare. I can assure you this country doesn't wish to either.

The problem, Mr. Chairman, as I see it, is -- do you and do we have enough wisdom and patience to find the means to avoid war: to engage in peaceful competition in such a manner as to avoid bringing about a war, even inadvertently or by adventurous third parties?

Before inviting you to make whatever statement to us you care to, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to my colleagues that

following the Chairman's remarks, if he is agreeable, I shall call upon the Members of the Senate each to ask one question of the Chairman. If there should be sufficient time, a second round may be possible.

Mr. Chairman, many of us observed you on television as you addressed the Press Club and answered questions a couple of hours ago. We are glad that, in a sense, we are now to continue that conversation, and now we await with much interest whatever you care to say to us.

Mr. Khrushchev: It is difficult to drink and talk at the same time. As a matter of fact, we have seen speakers who managed to drink and speak at the same time. But, in general I am in favor of tea.

Senator Fulbright: Well, we might find some vodka, or some bourbon, if you prefer.

Mr. K: It is a misconception to think that the Russians have such a proclivity for vodka, because if they only drink vodka, they would not have time to launch rockets to the moon. Drunkards can't do that. -- But, that is a joke.

Mr. Chairman, I can say that I am a reader of your speeches and statements, and I would like to express my gratitude for your invitation, and to say that I agree in full with everything you just had to say. There are probably other Senators present here, not only members of the Committee.

Senator Fulbright: That is right, some of our senior Senators, and most influential Senators.

Mr. K.: I would like to express my sincere appreciation for this honor which has been rendered me of meeting you. You are the people, on whom in a large measure depends the direction of the policies of this great country of the United States. Therefore, it is a pleasure for me to meet you to try to answer your questions, as far as my strength and wisdom permits me, the more so since I feel that I have known practically all of you a long time but up to now you have been sort of ethereal beings, to me, now, you have appeared in flesh.

- 3 -

There is hardly a Senator present here whose statements and speeches I haven't read. You will not be surprised if I say that I do not agree with much of what you say in the Senate, but even though I share your being here, I should speak the truth in that. It is no good recollecting what Senator said something bad or something good in the past. That is a matter of the past. We must face the future more and have wisdom enough to secure peace for our countries and for the whole world. We have always had great respect for the American people. We have also been somewhat envious of your achievements in the economic field, and for that reason, we are doing our best to try to catch up with you in that field, to compete with you, and when we do catch up, to move further ahead. I should say that future generations would be grateful to us if we managed to switch our efforts from stockpiling and perfecting weapons and concentrate those efforts fully on competition in the economic field. We are prepared for such competition. I should say that that is possible only under one condition.

I don't consider myself to be a young person, and being elderly, I can say that elderly people like old things. When a man buys a new pair of shoes, he does not feel comfortable in them, often, and throws them off sometimes and takes back the old pair of worn out shoes, to feel more comfortable. Things like that happen in a wider feel, too. When something new is born, it takes time for people to get used to it.

Or, to take another example, who of us has not been disappointed sometimes in life when a daughter was born instead of a son, or a granddaughter instead of a grandson, but sometimes nature provides a different result from what a man would want -- a result not which is/dependent upon the wishes of the person concerned. People have always fought for progress. In the past when there was a change-over from feudalism to capitalism, for instance, there have been revolutions in many countries.

When you fought your war of independence against the British, I am sure the King of England sent no messages of greeting to you, but irrespective of that, you struggled on until you achieved your aims. Your Civil War also was a progressive event, a struggle for the dignity of man, and the name of Lincoln as the leader of that struggle will live forever in the minds of men. He was a most human person who gave his life up for the dignity of man.

Now a new kind of society - a socialist society - has given birth, first in one country, and now in others - 12 or 13. You do not accept that new form of society, but the appearance of a new society in some particular country cannot be controlled from outside by other countries - no more than can the birth of a granddaughter instead of a grandson. And, therefore if we recognize that fact - that is to say, to recognize the right of any people to choose the kind of society that they want - if that fact alone is recognized, we should be able to secure peace on this earth. We want nothing from any other country. We have everything we need for the development of our economy. We have demonstrated this by the progress made in our country. The developments in other socialist countries we think have always confirmed that. We think that the practice in our country has confirmed our communist theories. We think that the social system we have is best fitted for our country. You must accept that. We do not ask approval from you. But this fact - the fact of the existence of a new society in some countries - must be accepted like, for example, I have come to accept this thing that I have on my face. It has bothered me and I can do without it, so must the fact that a new society exists must be recognized. That in fact is the main thing. There is no other problem, and if that is recognized, we should be able to secure firm and lasting peace. If, however, that fact is not recognized, we would hardly be able to avoid a conflict. That would mean that you would be trying to bring about a change in the social systems of the countries which have chosen a socialist way of life, and the peoples concerned would certainly defend themselves, which would bring about a conflict.

If I may be allowed to say a few critical remarks, gentlemen, I would say this, For instance, appropriation by the Congress of funds for subversive activities in other countries is an act which can hardly be conducive to peace and peaceful coexistence. I look upon that as an unreasonable act, and speaking in terms of a businessman, that is an enterprise which yields no profit. The capital appropriated ~~and~~ yields no profit, and therefore the appropriations are unreasonable. I do not want to preach to you. You are responsible for your own political actions. I do not ~~know~~ know what the custom is here - how you look upon guests who make statements that do not coincide with the views of the hosts - but in our country when guests come we welcome such statements.

My remarks have been rather lengthy, but I want to once again express my appreciation for having been invited here and to repeat that the only <sup>purpose we</sup> ~~purpose we~~ have in mind is to bring about peace and friendship with other countries - yours included. We bear heavy responsibility before the people and we must do our ~~best~~ best to meet the aspirations of the people and the main thing to which the people aspire today is peace. No doubt you prefer your own social system. We have nothing to say against that. Live under that system as long as you like, but recognize the fact that we prefer a different one and want to live under that. There was a time when people were burned for saying that the earth rotates. But there is no simpleton today who does not believe in that. Can you not recognize the possibility that opinions about social systems may not be entirely correct? But that is your business.

What is needed is to recognize the status quo, meaning that there exist two different social systems on this earth today, and that we must learn to live bearing that fact in mind; namely, the existence of two different systems in a world divided thus.

Since I have permitted myself to make some critical remarks in my statement, I have created the conditions for you to act similarly. I am prepared to listen to them and to reply.

Thank you.

- 6 -

Senator Fulbright: Mr. Chairman, I know we have all enjoyed your remarks. I particularly liked your last reference, when you said that in your country they welcome critical remarks and that you offered some and that this opens the gate for rejoinders and that they will not be resented. If I might start the questions before I call on some of my colleagues, I would like to pose this one.

I think there is some difference in the way we use words in your country and in our country. When you say that we appropriate funds for subversive activities, I am afraid I don't understand you because I do not believe that we have tried to subvert. On the contrary, we have moved to help countries such as the Philippines to take independence if they choose it. This is purely by way of background. My question is this.

Last night you said something very similar to what you have just said, but I will quote it: "Our countries have different social systems. We believe our system to be better--and you believe yours to be better. But surely we should not bring quarrels out onto the arena of open struggle. Let history judge which of us is right. If we agree to accept this principle, then we can build our relations on the basis of peace and friendship."

Mr. Chairman, I think that is a good statement. I believe we can agree to accept this principle if you and your allies accept it and if you and they refrain from using force to make independent peoples accept your system.

Mr. K.: We arranged with the President that with our meeting with him we would proceed, both of us, on the condition that we would not discuss the affairs of other countries besides the affairs of our countries because neither of us has received the authority to do so on the part of the others.

Senator Fulbright: My question is, how can we rely on this principle, which I think is a good one, when we see the attacks



- 7 -

by armed forces of your allies upon countries such as Korea, Tibet and now Laos. This is not letting history judge, this is judging by the sword.

Mr. K.: You see, this would mean that we would be discussing the actions of a third country, not your country or our country. We think that the best way out would be for you to establish direct discussions with those countries and discuss the matter yourself. Intermediaries in these matters would do no good. ~~xx~~ You probably know where China is geographically. I represent the Soviet Union - not China. I would be glad to answer any questions you have regarding the Soviet Union.

Senator Fulbright: Let me put it in another way. I am sure you are convinced of your system, but suppose it becomes clear that the non-communist countries are out-producing the communist countries and are attracting the allegiance of more and more of the world's people as compared to the communist system, will you accept this without the use of force, and is there any way you can give us assurance that you will.

Mr. K.: I would willingly reply to this. If history were to show that the capitalist system is more able to develop the creative force, the productive force than the communist system, I would be the first to raise my hand in favor of the capitalist system against the communist, because one cannot be ~~but~~ in favor of any system which brings nothing but poverty to the people. In that case I would face the question of whether I should join the Republican or the Democratic party. Although, frankly speaking, I don't see much difference, and therefore the choice would be a very difficult one.

Senator Fulbright: How can he be so lacking in discrimination? I can tell him which is the best party. ~~Comment~~ addressed to the interpreter, Mr. Troyanovsky/

Mr. K.: No, I prefer to take the decision myself. I am sure I know the advice you personally would give, but I am not sure that the advice is the correct one. But I don't want to interfere in your internal affairs. You have no need for that.



- 8 -

Senator Fulbright: Would the Chairman be willing to accept the two-party system if any of your allies chose that?

Mr. K.: If the people of the country concerned were to prefer that it would be up to the country to say.

Senator Fulbright: Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn to the senior member of the Senate. He has been in Congress since 1911. He is President pro tem of the Senate, which is the highest honor that we, the Senators, can bestow. And he is Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, which is, in a sense, the most powerful Committee in this body.

Mr. K.: That is the Committee on whom appropriations for subversive activities depends? /Smiling/

Senator Hayden: I ask this question because I know Chairman Fulbright has been interested. Would you be in favor of expanding the scope of international educational exchanges?

Mr. K.: Yes, we are in favor of widening these contacts, but I have been told by our Mr. Zhukov, Chairman of our Committee on Cultural Relations with other countries, that the American side has now provided us with their draft of a new agreement for 1960 for cultural relations, and that draft provides for some curtailment of our contacts as compared to this year.

Mr. Zhukov: If I may, I would like to add that this past year has been a year of very wide cultural contacts between our two countries. The counter draft advanced by the State Department provides for only two large-scale exchanges for 1960 and only one for 1961.

Senator Fulbright: I think there are perhaps two aspects of this. Is he thinking of the student and leader grants, or only of the artistic exchanges such as the ballet.

Mr. Zhukov: Out of the 14 exchanges in the technical field which we suggested, all of them were turned down by the State Department and the counter proposals made have been considerably less than the 14 we suggested.

- 9 -

Out of the 10 projects suggested by the State Department in technical exchanges, we accepted 5 and suggested that if the State Department would be able to accept at least 3 out of the 17 we suggested, we could come to an agreement. We would not be behind in these exchanges because we are in favor of wide artistic and technical and scientific exchanges.

Mr. K.: I can confirm this last statement.

Senator Fulbright: Now, Mr. Chairman, the Majority Leader of the Senate is from Texas, the largest - the second largest state in the country. Senator Lyndon Johnson.

Senator Johnson: I believe you have indicated that you would be willing to engage in joint exploration of outer space. Does that mean that you are willing to exchange scientists and engage in joint projects?

Mr. K.: No doubt.

Senator Johnson: Why have you not participated in the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee?

Mr. K.: I believe you know the reply to that. Because an attempt was made to place us in the position of a poor relation in that Committee and we wanted to have parity with you. Since you would not do so, we said we would not take part. For the time being, in practice only you and we can do anything about outer space. If that fact is recognized, we could find the organizational forms. We would not want to take part in a Committee to listen to the preaching of others while we would be in a position of poor relations there. You must not try to do harm to our self-esteem. We won't do it either. We can cooperate if that is understood.

Senator Fulbright: Next, Mr. Chairman. This is very interesting; they call me Chairman, but I think my influence is somewhat less than yours. I want to call now on the Minority Leader. As the leader of the Republicans, he represents the Minority Party. He is from Illinois and is one of our most influential members.

- 10 -

Senator Dirksen: Mr. Chairman, I have two questions. The first one is that, if it is true that newspaper dispatches from Moscow are still being censored, is there any hope that the censorship will be lifted so that free dispatches can be sent, as they are sent from the United States to the Soviet Union?

Mr. K.: You see, each of our countries has its own traditions and constitutions. For instance, a person can print practically anything he wants in your press. In our country if someone were to suggest an article for a newspaper containing appeals to war, that article would be turned down and the person would be put under trial because we have a law prohibiting any war-like appeals.

But everything that is conducive to better relations between countries and to the consolidation of people can be free to be sent out.

Senator Dirksen: There isn't the slightest restriction on Tass or any other paper on what they send to Washington. They sit free and send what they like. I am speaking about uncensored dispatches from correspondents from the Soviet Union. I understand that they are still censored.

Mr. K.: I must say that I read rather closely the dispatches sent by many American correspondents from our country and I find many of them very reasonable. As a matter of fact, there have been many occasions when I have thought them so good that I have asked our people to republish them in our newspapers. As for Tass, I might say that if a Tass correspondent were to send dispatches from this country which are mendacious in character, he would be recalled by the agency - recalled back home by the agency. But, for instance, if some correspondent were to send from Moscow a dispatch of the nature something like the first question which was offered to me at the Press Conference today, I am afraid our telegraph girls who send them over - our cablegrams - would refuse to send them over themselves. Therefore, as I say, we have certain rules at the present time in our country in that respect and we have no intention of changing them.

- 11 -

Senator Dirksen: That means that censorship will continue?

Mr. K.: I didn't call it censorship.

Senator Dirksen: Have you another name for it?

Mr. K.: Well, you can think of a name yourself. It's the same as we have an article in our laws preventing hooliganism, for instance.

Mr. Zhukov: I could give the Senator some examples of the things which foreign correspondents in our country try to send out -- things which are utterly offensive and in fact tantamount to hooliganism.

Senator Dirksen: Of course we place no restriction. We have complete freedom of travel in our country. We place no restriction on this. We do not say, "You can go to New York - not to California." Is there complete freedom in the Soviet Union, and if not, is it proposed to permit it?

Mr. K.: We could come to terms by offering you two miles for every - two miles in our country for every one mile travelled by our people in this country. But there is no reason for people to try to make their ways into other peoples' bedrooms when they are locked. That is considered undignified. Some people have a taste for peeping into other peoples' bedrooms.

Mr. Adzhubei: I will add that the Senator is not quite exact because, for instance, our Soviet correspondents to the United Nations <sup>are</sup> ~~was~~ very much restricted in their movements in this country, and personally, a year or so ago I was not allowed to travel even through the United States from South America where he was, despite the fact that I appealed personally to Mr. Dulles.

Mr. K.: Mr. Gromyko has just told me that without special permission a person of our country without special permission can not even travel from Washington to New York.

- 12 -

Mr. K.: But I will give a more direct answer. You want to travel anywhere you want in our country. If we abolish military bases on foreign territory, withdraw foreign troops to within their national frontier - if that is done, you would get permission to go anywhere you like in our country. But when our country is surrounded and circled by your military bases, and you want to have your correspondents or//people under the guise of correspondents go to places where we do not want them to go, we would regard that as military intelligence. And for that reason, we have closed up to foreign travel certain parts of our country which are particularly important for the country's defense.

Senator Fulbright: I would like to call on the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee who, I believe, ranks second in service in the Senate and who is one of the most influential members of our body.

Senator Russell: It is easy to see that our guest would be a most formidable antagonist in any parliamentary forum anywhere in the world.

Mr. K.: Not an antagonist but a defender.

Senator Russell: He apparently <sup>not only</sup> knows all the details about the government of his own country, which is a great achievement, but he knows the history of this country. I must say that I am amazed that he is so fully informed as to the attitude of the people of this country as to express the view that the American people, or any substantial number of them, have any desire to interfere in the internal affairs of Russia or to control the kind of government they may have.

And I know of no appropriations anywhere for any subversive work in Russia. I have been one member of the Appropriations Committee for 25 years.

You speak of self-determination, and we are for that. And personally I think I express the sentiment of most of the American people.

- 13 -

Now, our guest has spoken very eloquently on self-determination and people choosing their own form of government. I wonder if that indicates that he would be willing to submit that issue to a plebescite in East Germany.

Mr. K.: We have agreed, as I said, with the President that in our discussions we would not discuss the affairs of third countries. I am a Russian. Your question refers to German Democratic Republic. If you have any questions with regard to that state, it should be addressed to Prime Minister Grotewohl of that state because I have no wish to - - -. The address is Berlin, Germany.

Senator Russell: You have a great many things in your achievement - launching a rocket to the moon. We have had a few frustrations and failures. Did you have any before you got that one off to the moon?

Mr. K.: Well, you mustn't ask me that. Your Vice President has replied to that question already. Evidently he knows more than I do about it.

Senator Russell: The Fifth Amendment to your Soviet constitution must cover a very broad area.

Mr. K.: If you consider me to be a witness, I can reply to that question because I don't regard any answer that I may give as being prejudicial to my interests. There is one story I might mention. At one time we had the Prime Minister of the Ukraine, which was called then the Chairman of the Council of Peoples' Commissars, who was making a tour in the Ukraine, and he was accompanied by the editor of a newspaper, who is still alive, and I will not mention his name, and who liked sensationalism very much. And this prime minister made a speech in one city, which the editor published, and then he moved to another city - Odessa - where he read another speech which he had not yet delivered but which was already published in the local newspaper. Something like that happened to us because when I came to this country I read a statement by the Vice President saying that we had three failures before we launched the rocket, and the Vice President said he would not

reveal the secret source from which he got it. I am not sure that I did



As I said, since the Vice President seems to know more about it than I do, you had better ask him.

Senator Russell: Under our system I belong to a different party and I thought it might be better to address it to you.

Mr. K.: You must ask the Vice President; he says he has the secret source. And, furthermore, you are the representative of a party. He represents the people as a whole, being Vice President. He is above party in this respect. But if you wish, I can say something on the substance of the matter.

I don't know whether that remark is appropriate here, but they used to say in our country that everything needs an effort. It needs an effort even to kill flies, and you must realize, of course, that it takes a great deal of effort to launch a rocket of that kind. I can even reveal a secret. I hope I will not be condemned by my government for revealing the secret. I was not authorized to do so, but we have a democracy there and they will understand that I need to say ~~that~~ this in the polemics with you.

They wanted to launch that rocket about a week ago - our scientists - the rocket was prepared and put on the launching site. But when they started testing the apparatus - the equipment - they found that it wasn't working properly. Then after that they decided to take that rocket away and to put a new one in its place, prepare it, and launch it. The first rocket was not launched. It will be tested and if needed we might launch it later on, because it is still in its place. I can swear by the Bible that that is the fact. If the Vice President can, he might swear on the Bible that he was right, too.

Senator Russell: It was a great achievement, and I congratulate you.

Mr. K.: Thank you very much. I told the truth.

Senator Fulbright: Mr. Chairman, I want to call now on the man, - - - You mentioned recently that you were getting old. We have a man here who will be 92 next month, former Chairman and now Chairman Emeritus of the Committee, and one of the most distinguished men we have in this country.



- 15 -

Mr. K.: I did not call myself old, and I do not consider the Senator to be old, in spirit.

Senator Green: I will be glad to ask a question not only for myself but my colleagues. What actual measures do you have in mind that will make a contribution to peace, such as free elections in Germany or any of the Eastern European countries. Are you willing to permit a plebescite in East and West Germany in the next 10 (7) months?

Mr. K.: This question has been formulated in a somewhat different manner than it was previously, and because you and we were powers which fought together against Germany, I consider it appropriate to reply to this question. I know about our position in this respect. We have expounded it - repeated it - several times. Our position is that two independent German states have been set up in Western and Eastern Germany. And we think that the Germans themselves should decide on the question of reunification; otherwise, we would be prepared to accept their position. But I cannot speak to reply in full to that question. I would have to speak not only for Grotewohl but for Adenauer, too, and it would be best for those two to come together and decide that for themselves.

Senator Green: It is sometimes claimed that Russia has universal suffrage. If so, is it not true that election is limited to one party and one candidate?

Mr. Khrushchev: That is not quite exact, because in our parliament there are 40% of the members who are non-party - do not belong to any party. It is a fact, however, that they vote for only one candidate in a particular instance. I am not sure that you will understand my explanation of this, and I am sure that you do not agree with me on this matter.

Our explanation of this is that after the revolution in our country - after the great changes that took place - there are no classes in our country, and since parties represent different classes, we have only one party, representing the working people of the country as a whole. But several candidates are usually put up at a preliminary stage in our country. And under our

constitution, an unlimited number of candidates can be put up in any one constituency; and at the preliminary stage in some constituencies as many as five or six candidates are first put up, and a campaign is conducted for those candidates. But then before the elections, the representatives of the groups - the factories, plants which had put up these candidates - come together to decide and discuss, and decide which one of these candidates is most appropriate, and they usually come to an agreement among themselves on some one candidacy, and he is put up to be voted upon. We think that system is a democratic one. You have a different one - okay. But each people have their own system - their own customs.

Senator Fulbright: Mr. Chairman, the next member I would like to call upon is the former Chairman of this Committee, the ranking minority member of this committee, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, Senator Wiley.

Senator Wiley: Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege to listen to your performance on television when you spoke before the Press Club, and I must say that it was a masterful sales job. Now today you have repeated to a large measure that performance. You have said that because of your understanding with the President, we should not go into questions that relate to other countries, the Middle East countries and the Far East countries, Why we don't have free elections in Germany. My question is that you must have had a real purpose in coming to this country. You must have felt that the shrunken world with all these weapons presents a challenge for you and the President - that you might be able to come up with something. Would you mind telling us what you have in mind in talking with the President and what you expect to accomplish.

Mr. K.: Mr. Senator, I might address the question in a large measure to you, too, as members of this Committee, because the results of any discussion we have in a large measure depend upon your side, on the President and on this Committee. We, for our part, are prepared to go very far to bring about firm peace. For ~~we are prepared to go very far in the field of disarmament.~~ Our positions on these matters have been explained rather

- 17 -

clearly.

For instance, we are prepared to come to terms on the liquidation of foreign military bases and on the withdrawal of foreign troops to their national territories. The question is whether you would be willing to come to terms on that problem. If you are, that's fine. There has been thought by some people in this country that systems existing in Poland, and in Hungary, and in other countries where there would be Soviet troops are kept on because of the presence of Soviet troops in ~~these~~ these countries. Or that the matter should be tested by withdrawing all foreign troops from foreign territories and having the peoples of those countries prove the fact that the people of these countries have themselves chosen the form of government which they now have. There has been talk that the regime in Eastern Germany is kept only Soviet bayonets. Well, our reply to that is that foreign troops should be withdrawn both from Eastern and Western Germany to see how things would work out. Would you agree to that? If so, we could come to terms. You hesitate to reply. Well, I hesitate also to reply as to what results our discussions might yield, because the results depend not only upon our desires and wishes but on the plans of the United States. You might say that I am skillful at polemics, but this is not a matter of polemics but a matter of fact. It would be well if we could come to terms on the withdrawal of foreign troops and have all the soldiers return home. The mothers and the fiances would be very glad when their near ones come home.

Senator Fulbright: Gentlemen, the Ambassador made me promise positively that at 6:30 I would draw this meeting to a close. The Chairman is host at a dinner tonight and must be on his way to the Embassy. But, Mr. Chairman, I am sure I speak the sentiments of this gathering when I say that we all very much enjoyed meeting you and hearing you express yourself on many of the subjects which are of great interest to us. I am not sure we have

- 18 -

resolved all the difficulties, but we have taken one of the first steps. We hope that on your trip across this great country to the west that you will see a great many things of interest and that you will see many of the things that show what we have in common.

Senator Dirksen: I think that we should compliment Mr. Troyanovsky for the excellent job he has done today, as well as when Mr. Mikoyan and Mr. Kozlov were here with us.

Senator Fulbright: Indeed, I think we all would agree with giving him a raise!

Mr. K.: Since Mr. Troyanovsky has lived here quite a few years and is practically half American, you must pay part of the raise. What is the view of the Appropriations Committee on that?

Senator Fulbright: They will have to take it under consideration.